



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2003

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/448,756	11/24/1999	JUN KOYMA	0756-2070	5419
22204 7	590 07/01/2003			•
NIXON PEABODY, LLP 8180 GREENSBORO DRIVE SUITE 800 MCLEAN, VA 22102		EXAMINER		
			BELL, PAUL A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		•	2675	20

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
. Advisory Action	09/448,756	KOYMA ET AL.				
	Examiner	Art Unit				
<u>"</u>	PAUL A BELL	2675				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 30 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply to a				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I: ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	If extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);	·				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without cancelli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.				
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s): <u>112 1P or 1-38</u> .	·				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment				
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consi	dered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims we						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 1-38.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	•					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen						
10. Other:	/ to t	th				
	STEVEN SA SUPERVISORY PATEN TECHNOLOGY CEN	IT EXAMINER				
Retort and Trademark Office						

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: both displays made of LCD or LED emit light and each change luminous strength by electrical means. If applicant amends with (medium, "which is an emissive material", capable) it would overcome prior art of record but would be a new issue that would require a further search.